SINGLE BENCH (3)

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 3388 /2005

PETITIONER :- Sanjay Kumar Sahu son of Madan Lal Sahu, aged about 27 years, resident of village Kodasar, Tah. Takhatpur, District Bilaspur (C.G.).

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :-

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through- Secretary, Department of Panchayat & Rural Development Department, D.K.S. Bhavan, Raipur (C.G.).

2. The Gram Panchayat Thakur Kapa, Tah. Takhatpur, Distt. Bilaspur.

3. Raghunath Ram Sahu son of Faguram Sahu, aged about 34 years, R/o. Village Kodasar, Tah. Takhatpur, District Bilaspur (C.G.).

P.R. No. 3423/05 Presented by Shri K.K. Bhadauria dated 22/12/05

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(22)

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.No. 3388 **सन्** 2005

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश को दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	05.08.2005 Shri M.K. Bhaduri, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Vivek Sharma, Panel Lawyer for the State on advance copy. Heard on admission. This writ petition has been filed, challenging the impugned resolution of the Gram Panchayat dated 31.06.2005 (Annexure-P/2). Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that by the aforesaid resolution, the name of respondent No. 3 has been considered for appointment to the post of Panchayat Karmi by Panchayat. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, there are various deformities in the aforesaid resolution. He submits that respondent No. 3 cannot be appointed on the basis of resolution of Panchayat. It appears that the process of appointment is going on, the present respondent No. 3 has not been appointed on the said post. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the petition is premature. I am not inclined to entertain this writ petition. The same is dismissed at motion stage. It shall be open to the petitioner to avail appropriate remedy available under the law after the decision taken by the concerned authority in relation to the appointment of respondent No. 3, if the petitioner shall be aggrieved by the said appointment. With the above observations, the petition stands finally disposed of. Sd/- Sunil Kumar Sinha Judge	

10.8.05